

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview & Summary Information

Date Investment First Submitted: 2009-06-30
Date of Last Change to Activities:
Investment Auto Submission Date: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Investment Detail Update: 2012-02-24
Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update: 2012-08-21
Date of Last Revision: 2012-08-21

Agency: 024 - Department of Homeland Security **Bureau:** 60 - United States Coast Guard

Investment Part Code: 01

Investment Category: 00 - Agency Investments

1. Name of this Investment: USCG - Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE)

2. Unique Investment Identifier (Ull): 024-000006064

Section B: Investment Detail

- 1. Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

The Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) System is a fully deployed information technology investment that is in an operations and maintenance status. It continues to be effective in meeting its intended purpose and supporting new initiatives. Continued funding for operating support and making enhancements is necessary to meet continuing Coast Guard missions as well as evolving Homeland Security missions and new legislative requirements. For example, recent port and vessel security enhancements have been made to support the Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) and Security and Accountability for Every Port (SAFE Port) Act. MISLE is a mission essential application that directly supports Coast Guard missions rated under the PART Program, including: Drug Interdiction, Fisheries Enforcement, Marine Safety, Marine Environmental Protection (MEP), Migrant Interdiction, Port, Waterway and Coastal Security (PWCS), and Search and Rescue (SAR). MISLE collects, stores and disseminates data on vessels, cargoes facilities, waterways and parties (both individuals and organizations) as well Coast Guard activities involving all of these entities. MISLE Activities include, law enforcement boardings, vessel sightings, marine inspections, marine safety investigations, response actions, search and rescue operations, operational controls, and enforcement actions. MISLE is an integrated system that manages the flow information from the initial triggering event, to incident management and response, and the resulting follow-on actions. It improves efficiency by

reducing manual processing of information capture and communication. MISLE shares data with other systems to facilitate maritime domain awareness, data analysis, and program management. The data captured in MISLE is used to measure progress towards strategic goals. MISLE includes two citizen centric components. The Vessel Documentation System (VDS) allows the public to order Abstracts of Title via the internet. The Coast Guard Maritime Information Exchange (CGMIX) is collection of self-service internet web sites that provide information directly to the public on USCG approved equipment, incident investigations, MARPOL reception facilities and Coast Guard vessel actions. MISLE continues to be the most appropriate solution to meet Coast Guard operational requirements. No other system exists that can as effectively support and integrate the data required by the diverse CG operational missions.

2. How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.

The Marine Information for Safety & Law Enforcement (MISLE) system replaced the Marine Safety Information System (MSIS), Law Enforcement Information System (LEIS) and Search and Rescue Management Information System (SARMIS). MSIS was built in the early 1980's and provided support to the Marine Safety Program. LEIS supported law enforcement missions in a separate database and SARMIS supported Search and Rescue missions in another database. Due to hardware and software that was technologically obsolete and expensive to maintain, these systems were at high risk of failure and were not fully supporting Coast Guard marine safety and law enforcement mission needs. Gaps addressed by MISLE include:

- Created a single database for all Coast Guard Marine Safety and Law Enforcement missions. In MISLE, those missions share common vessel, party, facility, waterway and unit tables to create a unified view of mission activities. This in turn facilitated information sharing.
- Created the Vessel Identification System (VIS) as required by law (PL 100-710). None of the systems replaced by MISLE could have accommodated VIS.
- Improved the user interface and better aligned the information system with Coast Guard business processes.
- Eliminated redundant data entry.
- Created a mobile computing capability not available in the systems replaced by MISLE.
- Enhanced system reliability and availability.
- Consolidated system management and created efficiencies that reduced overall operation and maintenance cost.
- Created a geographic display of MISLE data.
- Added data analysis capability, including measurement and oversight information that was not previously available.

The MISLE acquisition project was completed in 2003. If Operations and Maintenance is not fully funded, the system cannot be patched and maintained to meet security and operational requirements. System reliability will decrease and Coast Guard personnel will not have the information needed to perform and manage their mission activities. For example, without historical information in MISLE to use in targeting activities, Coast Guard personnel will be less effective in accomplishing their marine safety, security and law enforcement missions. There are also certain documents that can only be created through MISLE, such as Certificates of Documentation and Certificates of Inspection. The inability to issue these documents would adversely impact maritime commerce.

3. Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.

FY 2011 (PY) Accomplishments - Improved system availability to users and reduced data errors. Continued funding for operating support and making enhancements is necessary to meet continuing current Coast Guard missions and new legislative requirements. For example, the port and security enhancements were made in MISLE to implement changes to CG missions required by the Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) and Security and Accountability for Every Port (SAFE Port) Act.

4. Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).

FY 2012 (CY) Planned Accomplishments - Continue to explore mobile computing technologies to improve operational efficiencies. FY 2013 (BY) Planned Accomplishments -Continue to improve system availability to users and reduce data errors to improve operational efficiencies.

5. Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.

1995-03-01

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	\$63.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	\$63.2	0	0	0
O & M Costs:	\$58.7	\$10.4	\$10.9	\$11.5
O & M Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	\$58.7	\$10.4	\$10.9	\$11.5
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	\$121.9	\$10.4	\$10.9	\$11.5
Total Govt. FTE costs:	0	0	0	0
# of FTE rep by costs:	0	0	0	0
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (\$)		\$0.0	\$0.0	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		0.00%	0.00%	

2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:

There are no fundamental or substantive changes.

Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value (\$M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
Awarded	7008	HSCGG310DP WV500									

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

EVM is required under all vehicles. Note that the total contract value for each vehicle represents all work performed in support of all systems hosted at the USCG Operations Systems Center. The DHS approved acquisition strategy for APLES and CTS replaces one support services task order (SETS) with two IDIQ contracts. MISLE funds a specific sub CLIN under APLES, and also funds an allocated portion of OSC infrastructure costs.

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities:

Section B: Project Execution Data

Table II.B.1 Projects					
Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M)
NONE					

Activity Summary								
Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities								
Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
NONE								

Key Deliverables								
Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)
NONE								

Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
% of User Satisfaction	Percent	Customer Results - Customer Benefit	Over target	0.000000	75.000000		75.000000	Semi-Annual
% of Availability	Percent	Technology - Reliability and Availability	Over target	90.000000	99.000000		99.000000	Monthly
Decrease Data Errors	Percent	Process and Activities - Quality	Under target	5.000000	1.000000		1.000000	Semi-Annual
Decrease system Response Time	Seconds	Technology - Efficiency	Under target	15.000000	2.000000		2.000000	Semi-Annual
Increase mobile computing usage for MISLE Boardings by 5%	Percent	Customer Results - Service Coverage	Over target	0.000000	5.000000		5.000000	Semi-Annual